Applicants : Stephen Todd et al.   Attorney's Docket No.: EMC-034PUS
Serial No. : 10/024,796
Filed   : December 19, 2001
Page   : 9 of 15

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 23 are pending in this application; of which claims 1, 21 and 22 are the

independent claims. Independent claims 1, 21 and 22 are amended. Dependent claim 23 is new.

Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting an interview on 19 October 2006.

Applicants during the interview indicated to the Examiner that the previous Office Action did not

address the first element in claim 1 because the first element was mistakenly construed to be part

of the preamble. The Examiner agreed and issued a Supplemental Office Action for which this

Response addresses.

Claims 1 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by

Raja et al. (U.S. Patent Application Number 20050049903 hereinafter "Raja").

Amended claim 1 is directed to a method of managing workflows in a service provider

environment in which a service provider provides data storage resources to a customer. The

method includes providing the customer with a list of types of work order requests based on a

permission level defining a level of access to the data storages resources allowed to the customer.

The work order requests include requests to manage configuration of the data storage resources

provided to the customer. The method also includes receiving a selection of a type of work order

request from the customer, enabling the customer to generate a work order request of the selected

type in a work order request submission, creating a database object based on the work order

request and storing the database object in a database.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of

claim 1. In particular, Raja does not disclose or suggest providing the customer with a list of

types of work order requests based on a permission level defining a level of access to the data

storages resources allowed to the customer (see, for example, page 9, lines 13 to 20 and page 14,

lines 15 to 31 of Applicants' specification).

The Examiner has likened Raja's time sheets to the claimed work order requests (see,

page 3 of the Office Action). In response to Applicants' arguments that a time sheet is not a

work order request, the Examiner stated that Applicants are arguing "intended use of the

method" (see last paragraph, page 7 of Office Action dated March 16, 2007). Applicants

respectfully submit that the Examiner has misinterpreted Applicants' arguments. Claim terms

are interpreted as broadly as reasonably allowed and the words of a claim must be given their

plain meaning unless the plain meaning is inconsistent with the specification (In re American

Academy of Science Tech Center, 367 F.3d 1359, 1369, 70 USPQ2d 1827, 1834 (Fed. Cir.

2004), In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) and MPEP

§2111.01). "[T]he ordinary and customary meaning of a claim term is the meaning that the term

would have to a person of ordinary skill in the art in question at the time of the invention, i.e., as

of the effective filing date of the patent application." Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303,

1313, 75 USPQ 2d 1321, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc). Applicants respectfully submit that a

person of ordinary skill in the art reasonably understands that a time sheet records time worked

and that a work order request is a request for work or tasks to be performed. A work order

request is used before work is performed and a time sheet is used after work has been performed.

Therefore, a time sheet and a work order contain mutually exclusive information and cannot be

substituted one for another. Thus, Applicant's claim term "work order request" is not an

intended use of the method.

Applicants : Stephen Todd et al.
Serial No. : 10/024,796
Filed : December 19, 2001
Page : 11 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: EMC-034PUS

Moreover, Raja does not disclose or suggest providing the customer with a list of types of work order requests. Raja discloses a time sheet which lists completed tasks (See Fig. 2, column 240, FIG. 7C and FIG. 13 of Raja). These tasks are not types of work order requests as claimed.

Furthermore, the Examiner has likened Raja's approving/disapproving timesheet entries to the claimed permission levels (see second paragraph, page 7 of the Office Action). Raja, as evident by the Examiner's interpretation of Raja, does not disclose or suggest data storage resources much less permission levels defining a level of access to data storage resources. Therefore, Raja does not disclose or suggest a permission level defining a level of access to the data storages resources allowed to the customer. Stated differently, approving/disapproving a time sheet entry is not the same as, or even suggestive of, providing a list of types of work order requests to a customer based on the customer's level of access to data storage resources (i.e., the customer's permission level).

Therefore, Applicants submit that Raja does not disclose or suggest providing the customer with a list of types of work order requests based on a permission level defining a level of access to the data storages resources allowed to the customer.

Applicants also submit that Raja does not disclose or suggest work order requests that include requests to manage configuration of the data storage resources provided to the customer.

Raja's patent application does not disclose or suggest providing data storage resources, but rather, is directed to a finance and time management system (see Abstract of Raja). The Examiner previously directed Applicant's attention to paragraph 0041 of Raja as support for the rejection. However, as pointed out by Applicants in the previous office action response, but not addressed by the Examiner in the latest office action,

Applicants : Stephen Todd et al.
Serial No. : 10/024,796
Filed : December 19, 2001
Page : 12 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: EMC-034PUS

... paragraph 0041 simply describes that the invention relates to apparatus for performing described operations and such apparatus can be specially constructed apparatus or can be a general purpose computer activated by a computer program that may be stored in a computer readable storage medium (see page 7 of Applicants' previous Office Action response).

Applicants respectfully submit that paragraph 0041 does not teach work order requests much less the work order requests that include requests to manage configuration of the data storage resources provided to the customer.

Therefore, Raja does not disclose or suggest work order requests that include requests to manage configuration of the data storage resources provided to the customer.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request that the Raja reference be withdrawn with respect to claim 1.

Claim 21 is an apparatus claim having corresponding features to claim 1. Applicants submit that the Raja reference should also be withdrawn with respect to claim 21 for at least the at least same reasons as claim 1. Moreover, Applicants have amended claim 21 to recite that the types of work order requests include at least one of requests to connect the data storage resources to a server, allocate the data storage resources to a customer account, create a mirror, restore remote mirroring or split a business continuance volume (BCV) (see, for example, page 11, lines 18 to 22 of Applicants' specification). It is submitted that amended claim 21 is further distinguished from the Raja reference, since Raja does not disclose or suggest the claimed arrangement in which the types of work order requests include at least one of requests to connect the data storage resources to a server, allocate the data storage resources to a customer account, create a mirror, restore remote mirroring or split a business continuance volume (BCV).

Claim 22 is an apparatus claim with all the elements being means-for claim elements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 6 having corresponding features to claim 1. Applicants submit

that the Raja reference should also be withdrawn with respect to claim 22 for at least the same

reasons as claim 1.

Applicants submit that all dependent claims now depend on allowable independent

claims.

Applicants further submit that Applicants' arguments in the previous Response dated 24

April 2006 were not all addressed by the Examiner as required by MPEP §707.07 (f) and

respectfully request such action. For instance, in the previous office action, the Examiner did not

respond to Applicants' arguments with respect to claim 2 that:

> …Raja neither describes nor suggests "providing to the customer at least
> one task screen corresponding to the selected type of work order request and
> usable by the customer to generate the work order request" as set forth in claim 2.
> The Examiner directs Applicant's attention to Figure 2 in this regard. However,
> again, Raja does not contemplate providing a customer with a list of types of
> work order requests or the claimed work order requests comprising requests to
> manage storage configuration, for reasons described above. Thus, Raja also does
> not contemplate a task screen corresponding to a selected type of work order
> request. The Figure 2 timesheet does not appear to correspond to a selected type
> of work order request and thus, does not appear to provide the claimed task screen
> corresponding to a selected type of work order request, as claimed (see pages 8
> and 9 of Applicants' previous Office Action response).

Nor has the Examiner responded to Applicants' arguments with respect to claim 3:

> Claim 3 is also further patentable over Raja, since Raja neither describes
> nor suggests work order requests comprising values of parameters specific to the
> selected type of work order request. Again, Raja does not contemplate providing
> a customer with a list of types of work order requests or the claimed work order
> requests comprising requests to manage storage configuration, for reasons
> described above. Regarding claim 3, the Examiner directs Applicant's attention
> to paragraph 0045 of Raja. In paragraph 0045, it is described that parameters of
> the time and financial data management system "are determined when a client
> hires a company to complete a project" and may include "the price the client will
> pay the company for completing the project; the rate of monetary billing and the
> base rate; such as dollars per hour, day or week per a resource's role or task. …"
> However, there is no teaching that such parameters are specific to a selected type

Applicants : Stephen Todd et al.   Attorney`s Docket No.: EMC-034PUS
Serial No. : 10/024.796
Filed   : December 19. 2001
Page   : 14 of 15

of work order request. as claimed (see page 9 of Applicants' previous Office Action response).

Applicants submit that each of the claims 2 and 3 if combined with their respective base claim and any intervening claims should be allowable.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the art rejection.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for withdrawing the prior art cited with regard to any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

It is submitted that this amendment places the application in condition for allowance or in better form for consideration on appeal, and thus, entry of this amendment is respectfully requested under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

All correspondence should be directed to the address below. Applicants' attorney can be reached by telephone at (781) 401-9988 ext. 23.

Applicants submit electronic payment concurrent with this submission to pay for excess

claim fees. No other fee is believed to be due for this Response; however, if any other fees are

due, please apply such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0845 referencing Attorney Docket:

EMC-034PUS.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _18 May 2007_____

_____
Anthony T. Moosey
Reg. No. 55,773

Daly, Crowley, Mofford & Durkee, LLP
354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A
Canton, MA 02021-2714
Telephone: (781) 401-9988 ext. 23
Facsimile: (781) 401-9966
atm@dc-m.com